(24)

HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH: BILASPUR

Writ Petition (S) No. 4144 of 2007

PETITIONER		Ku. Simta Verma, aged about 26 years, D/o. Narayan Verma, r/o. village Saja Tahsil – Saja, Distt. Durg (CG).
	Versus	
RESPONDENTS	1)	The District Collector, Durg.
	2)	Chief Executive Officer, Janpad Panchayat, Saja, Distt. Durg (CG).

(Writ Petition under Article 226 of the Constitution of India)

SB: Hon'ble Mr. Justice Satish K. Agnihotri

Present: Shri B.K. Chakravarty, counsel for the petitioner.
Smt. Anju Ahuja, Dy. Govt. Advocate for the State.

ORDER
(Passed on 16th July, 2007)

Pursuant to the advertisement dated 12-7-2002 (Annexure P/1), the petitioner along with others made an application for consideration to appoint her on the post of contract Teacher, Class II. After having participated in the selection process, the petitioner remained unsuccessful. Thereafter, according to the petitioner, a representation was made to the Collector, stating that there were several irregularities in the selection process. The petitioner kept waiting for about five years. Now, the petitioner has filed this petition on 15-7-2007 seeking a relief that she be given appointment as contract Teacher, Class II.

2) It is well settled principles of law that a candidate after having participated in the selection process, cannot raise the dispute with regard to the conduct of the examination on being unsuccessful. On other points also the petitioner, except making the self same statement to the effect that the

(25)

petitioner is more competent, has not produced any other documents in support of her contention with regard to the irregularities etc.

3) The petition is vague and does not make out a case for interference by this Court in its discretionary jurisdiction under Article 226 of the Constitution of India. The petitioner has also not shown any semblance of right or breach thereof as she has right to consideration, not right to appointment. The petitioner has exercised her right by participating in the selection process and thereafter remained unsuccessful. Thus, there is no merit in the petition and the same is dismissed.

Sd/-
Satish K. Agnihotri
Judge

raju